

**THE EFFECT OF USING LRD (LISTEN, READ, DISCUSS) STRATEGY
TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION OF THE SECOND YEAR
STUDENTS AT STATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 9 TAPUNG
KAMPAR REGENCY**



BY

**RENIWATI PUTRI
NIM. 10814001544**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1434 H/2013 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING LRD (LISTEN, READ, DISCUSS) STRATEGY
TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION OF THE SECOND YEAR
STUDENTS AT STATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 9 TAPUNG
KAMPAR REGENCY**

A Thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of Requirement
for the Undergraduate Degree in English Education
(S.Pd)



By

RENIWATI PUTRI

NIM. 10814001544

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1434 H/2013 M**

ABSTRACT

RENIWATI PUTRI (2012): The Effect of Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) Strategy toward Reading Comprehension of the Second Year Students at State Junior High School 9 Tapung Kampar Regency

Based on the researcher's observation, it was found that the students could not comprehend the meaning of texts in their text book at the school. This problem was caused by some factors. For example, some students could not understand about the content of reading text and identify the detailed information of the text. So, the researcher was interested in carrying out the research about this problem.

The research was administered at State Junior High School 9 Tapung Kampar Regency. The subject of the research was the second year students of State Junior High School 9 Tapung, and the object of this research was the effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy. The design of this research was quasi-experimental design. The type of quasi-experimental design of this research is nonequivalent control group design.

The population of this research was all of the second year students. The total number of population was 40 students; class VIII A consisted of 20 students as experimental group and class VIII B consisted of 20 students as control group. Because the population was not too big, so the technique used in taking the sample was total sampling technique. To analyze the data, the researcher adopted T-test formula by using SPSS 16.0.

After analyzing the data, the researcher found that there is significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy on reading comprehension at the second year students of State Junior High School 9 Tapung, where $T_{\text{calculated}}$ shows 3.781 at significant level of 5%, T_{table} shows 2.02, and at level of 1%, T_{table} shows 2.72. Thus, Null Hypothesis (H_0) is Rejected, and Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is Accepted, which shows $2.02 < 3.781 > 2.72$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT



All praises belong to Allah Almighty, the Lord of Universe, who rewards the researcher time, opportunity, energy, financial, health and the most is belief so the researcher is able to accomplish this project paper to fulfill one of the requirements for the award of undergraduate degree at English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. Shalawat and gratitude do to our noble character, the prophet Muhammad peace be upon him, he is a teacher of teachers, he is as the best educator that teaches and educates the human kind so he has brought us from darkness to the lightness.

In conducting the research and finishing this project paper, the researcher got suggestions, encouragements, motivation, and supports from many sides. Therefore, in this chance and opportunity, the researcher would like to express the great thanks and gratitude to those who have given the researcher a lot of things that researcher is able to finalize and publish this research:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
2. My beloved parents; Razali and Sumiati who given great love, advice, support and pray.
3. My beloved young brother; Muhammad Jefri and Didin K. who have given writer support to accomplish this thesis.

4. My beloved young sister: Yeni Wati Am.d, Iyeti Maynita S.P thanks for your love, support and inspiration. I love you all.
5. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag, the Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University Sultan of Syarif Kasim Riau.
6. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd, the Chairperson Department of English Education for her guidance to complete this thesis.
7. Dedy Wahyudi, M.Pd, the Secretary of English Education Department.
8. Rizki Fiprinita, M.Pd, the Researcher's Supervisor who has guided the researcher in completing this project paper.
9. All lectures who have given their knowledge and insight through the meeting in the class or personally.
10. Aida Wisrilila S.Pd, the Headmaster of SMPN.9 Tapung and his staff and teachers who have given their kindness as long as the researcher took the data.
11. Batman S.Pd, the English teacher of SMPN.9 Tapung who has given the researcher guide and advice in conducting the research.
12. My best friends and all classmates: Mery Eryanti S.Pd, Shafria D.M, Ra, Indah, Jiun, Nunung, Pu3, Nita, Desis, Ida, Kasih, Rina, Resti, Eka, Fiqoh, Retno, Rewis and Students of English Education Department in the academic year 2008. I never forget you all.

Finally, the researcher realizes that this paper has many weaknesses and shortcomings. Therefore, comments, critiques, suggestions and advices are

seriously needed in order to improve this project paper. May Allah Almighty bless them all. Aamiin....

Pekanbaru, November 20th 2012

The Writer

Reniwati Putri

NIM: 10814001544

LIST OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| SUPERVISOR APPROVAL | i |
| EXAMINER APPROVAL | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | iii |
| DEDICATION | vi |
| ABSTRACT | vii |
| LIST OF CONTENTS | x |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | xiii |
| | |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. The Background of the Problem | 1 |
| B. The Definition of the Term | 6 |
| C. The Problem | 7 |
| 1. The Identification of the Problem | 7 |
| 2. The Limitation of the Problem..... | 7 |
| 3. The Formulation of the Research | 8 |
| D. The Objectives and the Significant of the Research..... | 8 |
| 1. The Objectives of the Research..... | 8 |
| 2. The Significance of the Research..... | 9 |
| E. The Reason of Choosing the Title..... | 9 |
| | |
| CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE | 11 |
| A. The Theoretical Framework | 11 |
| 1. The Nature of Reading | 11 |
| 2. Teaching Reading... .. | 12 |
| 3. The Nature of Listen-Read-Discuss Strategy | 16 |
| 4. The Procedure of Listen-Read-Discuss Strategy | 17 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| B. The Operational Concept | 18 |
| C. The Relevant Research..... | 20 |
| D. The Assumption and the Hypothesis..... | 22 |
| CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD | 23 |
| A. The Research Design..... | 23 |
| B. The Time and Location of the Research | 24 |
| C. The Subject and Object of the Research | 25 |
| D. The Population and Sample of the Research..... | 25 |
| E. The Technique of Collecting Data | 26 |
| 1. The Validity and Reliability Test..... | 27 |
| a) Validity..... | 28 |
| b) Reliability..... | 29 |
| F. The Technique of Data Analysis..... | 31 |
| CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS | 32 |
| A. Data Description..... | 32 |
| B. Data Presentation | 33 |
| C. Data Analysis..... | 35 |
| CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION | 42 |
| A. Conclusion | 42 |
| B. Suggestions | 43 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| TABLE III.1 | Research Type | 25 |
| TABLE III.2 | Distribution of the Research Population and Sample | 27 |
| TABLE III.3 | The Categorizing Levels of Scoring of Reading Comprehension | 28 |
| TABLE III.4 | Case Processing Summary | 30 |
| TABLE III.5 | Scale Statistic | 31 |
| TABLE III.6 | Reliability Statistics | 31 |
| TABLE IV.1 | The Score of Pre-test and Post-test of The Students' Reading Comprehension of Experimental and Control Classes | 36 |
| TABLE IV.2 | The Frequency Distribution Pre-Test of Experimental Group | 38 |
| TABLE IV.3 | The Frequency Distribution Post Test of Experimental Group | 39 |
| TABLE IV.4 | The Frequency Distribution Pre-Test of Control Group ... | 40 |
| TABLE IV.5 | The Frequency Distribution Post Test of Control Group .. | 40 |
| TABLE IV.6 | Descriptive Statistics | 41 |
| TABLE IV.7 | Independent Samples Test | 42 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Problem

In English, there are four important language skills that must be mastered by the students. They are reading, writing, speaking and listening¹. Reading is the most crucial skill that should be developed by the students. In reading, most of the students can get much information based on what they read such as health, technology, art, politic, culture, sport, etc. It can occur when the students are able to comprehend the text or passage. By strengthening reading skills, students will make greater progress and development in all other areas of learning². So, in reading students can understand the text and get information about part of the text easily.

Reading is one of the skills that should be considered in learning language. It is strongly relate to develop other language skills, such as writing, listening, and speaking. Reading is an activity with a purpose. A person may read in order to gain information to verify existing knowledge, criticize a writer's ideas of writing style. A person may also read for enjoyment, enhancement of knowledge of the language being read³.

¹ Brown H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.1994). p.217.

²David Nunan. *Practical English Language Teaching*.(Sydney: McGraw Hill. 2003). p.69.

³ Kalayo and Ansysari. *Teaching English as A Foreign Language (TEFL)*.(Pekanbaru: Alaf, 2007).p.144

The purpose of reading based on the standardization of English course competences is to understand the meaning (interpersonal, ideational, text) in some written texts that have communicative purpose, structural text, and certain linguistics.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that reading is a process of interaction between reader and the written material in transferring, understanding, and comprehending the reading text. In reading, the reader should make a good interaction in order to gain the information from the text.

It means that, reading includes a receptive skill. Therefore, a reader should have the best strategy to obtain a good comprehension of the messages in reading text. Therefore, reading learning process is necessary to get a well comprehension. In learning process, a teacher uses a reading strategy in teaching reading. As defined by David Pearson and his colleagues, reading comprehension strategies are “conscious and flexible plans that readers apply and adopt a variety of texts and tasks⁴. In reading comprehension students can understand the text and get information about part of the text easily.

According to syllabus 2011-2012 at the first year, duration to teach reading is 40 minutes for twelve times of meeting. In syllabus, there are some competences that are taught, the competencies are to make students able to understand the meaning in

⁴ Michael F. Graves. *Teaching Reading in the 21st Century* (New York : A Pearson Education Company, 2001), p. 310

short functional text and simple essay in descriptive, recount, narrative, and procedure in daily habit⁵.

According to School Based Curriculum (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan—KTSP in 2007), the purpose of teaching English in Junior High School 9 Tapung Kampar Regency, especially in reading skill is to express the various meaning of interaction of oral text and monolog in descriptive, narrative, recount, procedure, report and anecdote text.⁶ As the basic one stated for second grade is that “students will be able to comprehend the descriptive text”⁷. In this research, the writer focuses on descriptive text.

When the students learn to make connection from their experience to the text, they are currently reading. As good readers, they think about what they are reading and considering how it fits what they already know. The students in learning English, they should understand what they are learning because there is a complex connection between authors to the readers and the messages conveyed between authors to the reader. Therefore, the students have to have the strategy to be applied in reading.

The success of teaching reading for Junior High School 9 Tapung is determined by many aspects such as: material of reading, facility, teachers’ competence, and the students themselves. In teaching English at the second year of Junior High School 9 Tapung, the teacher teaches the students by using explanation strategy. It means

⁵Syllabus of SMPN9 Tapung 2011/2012

⁶Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. *Kurikulum 2004 Standard Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMP/MTs*. (Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum, 2003).

⁷Syllabus SMPN9 Tapung 2010-2011. (Tapung: 2010)

that the teacher gives explanation to the students about the materials and then the teacher asks the students to question and give respond. That is done by the teacher continuously.

From the explanation above, ideally the students at the second year of Junior High School should be able to understand the topic of reading well. In short, they have no problem in Reading, but the fact has shown that the students were not able to comprehend reading text and the students could not also understand what the reading text was talking about.

Based on the descriptive above, students in Junior High School 9 Tapung should be able to comprehend a text well because the teacher had used a good technique in teaching reading. In fact, the teacher still finds that many students have problem in comprehending the text, especially in descriptive text. It can be itemized into the following symptoms:

1. Some of the students cannot find main idea in the paragraph.
2. Some of the students cannot identify the general information in the text.
3. Some of the students cannot find synonym of word.
4. Some of the students cannot identify the generic structure in the text.
5. Some of the students are unable to find the purpose of the text.

Based on the researcher's preliminary study, the teacher on by determined the students' reading ability by looking for how many the questions were correct. The students were not taught about critical thinking of the topic given. To anticipate this situation, the teacher should refurbish what the appropriate strategy in teaching

reading is. It is purpose to make the students able to comprehend the text given by the teacher. The use of reading strategies is the most important factor in term of reading comprehension. The researcher offers one strategy in reading comprehension namely Listen-Read-discuss (LRD) strategy⁸.

There are three stages in the reading process: before reading, while reading, and after reading. In general, the following reading strategies are used by the learners in the reading process: finding a focus for understanding, establishing a relationship between initial learning and text meaning, thinking about the meaning of text, making conclusion about the test, using prior knowledge for comprehension, controlling reading speed, making predictions about the meanings of unfamiliar words, and making predictions about the meanings of unknown groups of words or sentences in the text. The LRD strategy has been found to be a powerful means of improving reading comprehension and content learning in both weak and proficient readers.

Based on the explanation and the problem above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled: **“THE EFFECT OF USING LISTEN, READ, DISCUSS (LRD) STRATEGY TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT STATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 9 TAPUNG KAMPAR REGENCY”**.

⁸Anthony V. Manzo and UlaCasaleManzo. *Teaching Children to be Literate: A Reflective Approach*. (Sea Horbor: Literacy Leaders, 1995), p.377

B. The Definition of the Term

The definitions of terms in this title are:

1. Effect

According to Homby, effect is a change produced by an action or a cause a result, an outcome.⁹

2. L-R-D (Listen, Read, Discuss) Strategy.

L-R-D is a reading comprehension strategy and the L-R-D has been found to be a powerful means of improving reading comprehension and content learning in both weak and proficient readers.¹⁰

- a. Listen: Teaching presents a lecture on the content of the reading that includes a graphic organizer of the information you discuss.
- b. Read: Students read the selection, guided by idea that the reading may provide another understanding or interpretation of the content.
- c. Discuss: Discussion of material. Encourage students to reflect on the differences between their reading of the content and presentation.

3. Reading

Reading is an interactive process that goes on between the reader and the text, resulting in the comprehension.¹¹

⁹ A.S. Homby. *oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford University Press Oxford, p.138

¹⁰ Watkins McKenna and Manzo. *Teaching Children to be Literate A Reflective Approach*. In Progress, 1993. p.378

¹¹ Kalayo Hasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan, *Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)*, (Pekanbaru: Alaf, 2007), p.114

4. Comprehension

A definition of comprehension is presented¹² and Comprehension is an active process to which each reader brings his or her individual attitudes, interests, expectations, skills, and prior knowledge (reader context).¹³

C. The Problem

1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the background of the problem above, it is very clear that most of the students at Junior high school 9 Tapung still get some problems in their reading comprehension. To make it clearer, the writer identifies the problems as follows:

- a. Why are some of the students unable to find main idea in the paragraph?
- b. Why are some of the students unable to get information from the text?
- c. Why are some of the students unable to find synonym of word?
- d. Why are some of the students unable to identify generic structure in text?
- e. Why are some of the students unable to find purpose of the text?

2. The Limitation of the Problem

Because the writer finds many problems in this research, the writer limits the problem to improve students' reading comprehension to find purpose of the text, to find main idea, to get information from the text, to find synonym of the word, and to

¹² Judith WestphalIrwin.*Teaching Reading Comprehension Process*.(Loyola University of Chicago,1986), p.1

¹³*Ibid*.pp.7

find generic structure in text. Therefore, this study focuses on the effect of using Listen, Read, Discuss (LRD) strategy toward reading comprehension of the second year students at SMPN 9 Tapung Kampar Regency. Then, the reading text used by the research is descriptive text.

3. The Formulation of the Research

The problems are formulated as follows:

- a. How is students' reading comprehension by using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy at State Junior High School 9 Tapung?
- b. How is students' reading comprehension without using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy at State Junior High School 9 Tapung?
- c. Is there any significant effect of the using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward students' reading comprehension?

D. The Objectives and the Significance of the Research

1. The Objectives of the Research

- a. To find out the students' reading comprehension in descriptive text that is taught by using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy.
- b. To find out the students' reading comprehension in descriptive text that is not taught by using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy.
- c. To find out the significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension.

2. The Significance of the Research

Related to objectives of the research above, the significance of the research are as follows:

- a. To give some information to the teacher about the effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward students' reading comprehension in descriptive text.
- b. To give some contribution to the students in order to improve their reading comprehension in descriptive text.
- c. To encourage the researcher's knowledge about the topic conducted.

E. The Reason of Choosing the Title

The writer is interested in carrying out a research on the topic above based on some statements below:

1. The title of this research is relevant with the writer's major as the English Education Department Student.
2. As far as the writer is concerned, this research title has never been investigated by other researches yet.
3. The writer is very interested in carrying out this research in order to know the effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, and Discuss) strategy toward students' reading comprehension.

The writer finds out the solution of the students' problem in reading comprehension, especially for the second year students at SMPN 9 Tapung Kampar Regency.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Framework

1.The Nature of Reading

Reading is one of the most important skills in learning a language. Reading is a means of the language acquisition of communication and information sharing of ideas. Like all languages, it is a complex interaction between the text and the reader. Reading is more than merely referring to the activity of pronouncing the printed material or following each line of written page. It involves various and mixed activities. Reading is not to be a passive activity but reading is an active process in which readers relate information in the text to what they already know. According to KalayoHasibuan, the text presents letters, words, sentences and paragraphs that encode meaning. The reader uses knowledge, skills, and strategies to determine what the meaning is¹⁴. Readers' knowledge, skills, and strategies include:

1. Linguistic competence: the ability to recognize the elements of the writing system; knowledge of vocabulary; knowledge of how words are structured into sentences.
2. Discourse competence: knowledge of discourse markers and how they connect parts of the text to one another.

¹⁴KalayoHasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan.*Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)*.(Pekanbaru: Alaf,2007) p.115

3. Sociolinguistic competence: knowledge about different types of texts and their usual structure and content.
4. Strategy competence: the ability to use top-down strategies as well as knowledge of the language (a bottom-up strategies).

Reading is an act of reading something like articles, book etc that are intended to be read¹⁵. From all of the opinion about reading, it can be concluded that reading is a process of interaction between reader and the written material in transferring, understanding and comprehending about the reading text. In reading, the reader should make a good interaction in order to gain the information from the text.

2. Teaching Reading

According to Murcia reading is to learn which involves complex thinking skills in which students must comprehend the material from a text by using their own thought activities which can help them analyze texts¹⁶.

Reading is a dynamic process in which the reader works actively to construct meaning from the material (Barton, 1997). Students need to have the abilities to adjust their reading to fit the type of material being presented. Effective readers are involved in the process of reading, actively looking for meaning. Ineffective readers play a passive role when reading, not connecting the text material with prior knowledge. So, the writer can conclude that reading is a skill that presents the author's

¹⁵ A.S. Homby. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: University Press Oxford, p. 357

¹⁶ Marianne Celce-Murcia Lois McIntosh. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers Inc, 1979), p. 200

idea and the reader must have a good interaction with the text in order to get the meaning of the text.

Content area teachers can equip their students with strategies that will help their access and use background knowledge, text feature knowledge, and general knowledge gained from the world, or some would call it, common sense knowledge.

a. Principles for Teaching Reading

The following principles can guide the design and practice of a reading program. For another list of principles, see Williams (1986).¹⁷

Meaning-focused Input

- 1) Practice and training in reading should be done for a range of reading purposes. A reading course should cover these purposes of reading to search for information (including skimming and scanning), reading to learn, reading for fun, reading to integrate information, reading to criticize texts, and reading to write.
- 2) Learners should be doing reading that is appropriate to their language proficiency level. The course should include reading simplified material at a range of levels, particularly extensive reading of graded readers.
- 3) Reading should be used as a way of developing language proficiency. Learners should read with 98 percent coverage of the vocabulary in the text, so that they can learn the remaining percent through guessing from context.

Meaning-focused Output

¹⁷Nation, I.S.P. *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing ESL & Applied Linguistic Professional Series*. (New York : First Published,2009).p.6

Reading should be related to other language skills. The course should involve listening, speaking and writing activities related to the reading. For example, Simcock (1993) used the ask and answer technique and several others described later in this book.¹⁸

b. Intensive Reading

Intensive study of reading texts can be a means of increasing learners' knowledge of language features and their control of reading strategies. It can also improve their comprehension skill. It fits into the language focused on learning strand of a course. The classic procedure for intensive reading is the grammar-translation approach where the teacher works with the learners, using the first language to explain the meaning of a text, sentence by sentence. Using suitable texts and following useful principles, can be a very useful procedure as long as it is only a part of the reading program complemented by other language-focused learning and by extensive reading for language development and extensive reading for fluency development.¹⁹ Intensive reading focuses on comprehension of a particular text with no thought being given to whether the features studied in this text will be useful when reading other texts. Such intensive reading usually involves translation and thus comprehension of the text.

Based on the explanation above, the writer can conclude that one goal of the intensive reading is to comprehend the text. The use of translation makes sure that

¹⁸Nation, I.S.P. *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing* ESL & Applied Linguistic Professional Series. (New York : First Published, 2009).p.7

¹⁹*Ibid.*p.25

learners understand, and when the learners do some of the translation by themselves, it allows the teacher to check whether they understand, or not.

Christine Nuttall mentions that there are five types to classify reading comprehension questions²⁰, there are:

1. Question of literal comprehension.

There are questions, directly and explicitly available in the text. Questions of this kind could often be answered in the words of the text itself. The questions are essential preliminaries to serious work of the text, because until you are sure that the plain meaning of the text has been grasped.

2. Questions involving reorganization or reinterpretation.

These are questions which require the students to obtain literal information from various parts of the text and put it together or to reinterpret information. The questions are valuable in making the student consider the text as a whole rather than thinking of each sentence on its own or making him assimilates fully information.

3. Question of inference.

These are questions that oblige the students to read between the lines to consider what is implied but not explicitly stated. Questions of this kind are considerably more difficult than either of the former types. Because these questions require the students to understand the text well enough to work out its implications.

²⁰Christine Nuttall. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. (London,1982),p132

4. Questions of evaluation.

Evaluation questions involve the students in making a considered judgment about the text in terms of what the writer is trying to do, and how far the writer has achieved it. For example: The writer's honesty or bias (e.g. in newspaper reporting or advertising copy).

5. Question of personal response.

The student is not asked to assess the techniques, by means the writer influences them, but simply record his reaction to the means of the text.²¹

Based on the explanation above, the writer is interested in these types of questions because the writer focuses on how good the students can comprehend the basic information that can be found from the text.

3. The Nature of Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy

According to Manzo&Casale, et al. Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) is a comprehension strategy that builds students' prior knowledge before they read a text. It is a powerful tool for engaging struggling readers in classroom discussion. Since the content is initially covered orally, students are unable to read the entire text on their own to gain at least a surface level of understanding about the reading. Those students lacking prior knowledge about the content gain it during the listening stage, allowing them to more easily comprehend the text during the reading stage²². Listen-

²¹Christine Nuttall. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*.(London,1982),p.133

²²Anthony V. Manzo and UlaCasaleManzo.*Teaching Children to be Literate: AReflective Approach*.(Sea Horbor: Literacy Leaders,1985), p.377

Read-Discuss strategy is relatively easy to create because they can enhance a student's understanding about many lessons. There are procedures of LRD to follow:

1. Listen: Teaching presents a lecture on the content of the reading that includes a graphic organizer of the information you discuss.
2. Read: Students read the selection, guided by idea that the reading may provide another understanding or interpretation of the content.
3. Discuss: Discussion of material. Encourage students to reflect the differences between their reading of the content and presentation.

According to Manzo&UlaCasaleManzoet. al. say that the LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy was created as a “starter” method for bridging traditional instruction to a more interactive approach. Traditional reading-based instruction typically begins by having students read the assignment, listen to brief lecture or overview by the teacher, and then discuss their responses to questions.

4. The Procedure of Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy

- a. Have students re-read the information covered in the L-R-D format rapidly to increase their speed or reading and thought processing.
- b. Inform the class that you will lecture, intentionally omitting a few important details that they will need to read their texts to discover.
- c. Inform the class that your lecturer will cover all the details of a lesson but that they will need to read to discover what question these detail answer. This is one way to teach students to actively seek an understanding of the concept base, or central question, around which an area of study is focused.

- d. Inform the class that a quiz will follow the L-R-D sequence. Give practice in test taking, and set the stage for question and discussion about how to study effectively.
- e. Invert the core process occasionally by having the class L-R-D or read (for about 15 minutes, then listen, and finally discuss).
- f. Ask students which portions of the text struck them as inconsiderate, that is, poorly written, poorly organized, or presuming too much prior knowledge. This activity can help students learn when to ask for help with textual and class material.²³

Finally, based on the explanation above, using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy, can help students in reading text because the entire process of teaching reading by using Listen-Read-Discuss strategy will activate students in reading. They will interact with others to discuss the option of target language. In this strategy, students will be motivated to gain the meaning of the text.

B. The Operational Concept

The operational concept is a concept as a guidance used to avoid misunderstanding. It should be interpreted into particular words in order to make it easier to measure. This research is experimental research which focuses on gaining the effect of using LRD (listen, read, discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension. Therefore, in analyzing the problem in this research, there are two variables used, they are: Variable X: LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy and variable Y: Reading comprehension in descriptive text.

²³Ibid.p.378

1. Variable X: LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy

The following treatment is a collection of procedures of the implementation of LRD strategy, Manzo (1985) states that LRD is the core process occasionally by having the class LRD²⁴, The steps are as follows:

- a. Select a portion of text to be read. Teacher uses graphic organizer as medium in presenting information or summary of the text. Students should listen a summary of the text presented by their teacher.
- b. Teacher asks the students to read the text and compare what they have listened to their understanding of the text on their own.
- c. Teacher asks the students to discuss their understanding of what they have read and listen to other students in small group. One group consists of three or four students'.
- d. Teacher asks the students to report the result of discussion.

2. Variable Y (Reading Comprehension):

- a. Students are able to find main idea in the paragraph
- b. Students are able to get information from the text
- c. Students are able to find synonym of word
- d. Students are able to identify the generic structure of the text.
- e. Students are able to find purpose of the text.

²⁴Anthony V. Manzo and UlaCasaleManzo. *Teaching Children to be Literate: A Reflective Approach*. (Sea Horbor : Literacy Leaders, 1995), p. 379

C. The Relevant Research

According to Syafi'i, relevant research is required to observe some previous researches conducted by other writers in which they are relevant to our research it.²⁵

Besides, the writer has to analyze what the point was focused on, the design, finding, and conclusion of the previous research.

1. The research conducted by: Norzazili (2011), He focused on The Application of "Listen-Read-Discuss" to Increase the Ability of the Second Year Students of Ma Darel Hikmah Pekanbaru in Comprehending Analytical Expository Texts. The Use LRD strategy could increase student's ability in comprehending analytical expository texts. The improvements can be seen from the increase of the students' scores in reading test from the post test. In fact in the data, we can see the average score of the pre-test was 48.78 (poor level). Even though, the average score of post-test was 72.13 (average to good level). The students' ability was increased from the pre-test to the post-test, 23.35 points. It means that the attainment of learning passing grade post-test was better than pre-test.²⁶
2. The research conducted by: Yusni Dian Rakhmawati (2011) Implementation of LRD (Listen-Read-Discuss) model could improve speaking skills in fourth-grade students of SDN Sumber Sari 2 Malang. This study was a classroom-action research. Thus the researchers used the Classroom Action Research (PTK) which covered two cycles.

²⁵ Syafi'i, *From Paragraph to a Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purpose*, (Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2011), p.122

²⁶ Norzazili. The Application of "Listen-Read-Discuss" to Increase the Ability of the Second Year Students of Ma Darel Hikmah Pekanbaru in Comprehending Analytical Expository Texts. (Pekanbaru: 2011).

Each cycle consisted of four stages: 1) planning, 2) action, 3) observation, and 4) reflection. The research data were obtained through test and non-test. The data of retrieval tool used in the form of a test instrument contained the action aspects of the assessment criteria for speaking skills. Retrieval tool was used in the form of non-test observation, interviews, and documentation (photos). Furthermore, the data were analyzed quantitatively. Activities performed in this study were based on the steps of: (1) listening, (2) reading, (3) Discussing, and (4) speaking. Based on the results of research that result in the learning process of learning to speak through LRD model had increased when being compared with the previous. The value of pre-action speaking skills was average grade of 65, on average 1 cycle 70 class, the second cycle of the average grade was 78. Thus speaking skills through a model of LRD (Listen-Read-Discuss) could improve speaking skills in fourth-grade students of SDN Sumber Sari 2 Malang.²⁷

This research is different from the two researches above. In this research, the writer uses LRD (Listen, Read, and Discuss) Strategy to know its effect toward reading comprehension of the second year students at State Junior High School 9 Tapung Kampar Regency.

²⁷Yusni Dian Rakhmawati .*Implementation of LRD (Listen-Read-Discuss) Model could Improve Speaking Skills in Fourth-Grade Students of SDN Sumber Sari 2 Malang.*(Malang:2011).

D. The Assumption and Hypothesis

1. The Assumption

In this research, the writer assumes that as researcher should have ability to the procedures of the strategy properly.

2. The Hypothesis

Based on the assumption above, hypothesis of this research can be stated as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward students' comprehension in descriptive text.

Ha: There is a significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward students' comprehension in descriptive text.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Research Design

The type of the research was quasi experimental design. The kind of quasi experimental design of this research was nonequivalent control group design. It involves random assignment of intact groups to treatments, not random assignment of individuals.²⁸ There were two classes in this research; control and experimental classes. According to Jhon W. Creswell that quasi-experiments design are experimental situations in which the writer assigns, but not randomly, participants to Classes because the experimenter cannot artificially create groups for the experiment.²⁹

The experimental class was taught by using particular treatment LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy to improve students' reading comprehension. In addition, control class was only given a pre-test and post-test without particular treatment as what was given for experimental group³⁰. These group used different techniques, but both experimental and control classes were treated with the same test.

²⁸L. R. Gay and Peter Airasian, *Educational Research*, (New Jersey: Prectice Hall Inc, 2000), p. 395.

²⁹ John W. Creswell, *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: Pearson Education Ltd., 2008), p. 645.

³⁰ Ibid.p.646

Table III. 1

Research Type

| GROUP | PRE-TEST | TREATMENT | POST-TEST |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| A | T1 | | T2 |
| B | T1 | X | T2 |

Experimental:

A : Experimental group

B : Control group

T1 : Pre- test for experimental group and control group

: Receiving particular treatment

X : Without particular treatment

T2 : Post- test for experimental group and control group.

After giving particular treatment to the experimental group by using LRD (Listen-Read-Discuss) strategy, the scores between experimental and control groups were analyzed by statistical formula. It was aimed to know whether there was or not the effect of variable X into variable Y.

B. The Time and Location of the Research

This research was conducted at the second year students of Junior High School 9 Tapung Kampar Regency. It is located at Garuda Sakti Km. 24, Kampar Regency. The time to conduct this research was from July to September 2012.

C. The Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of this research was the second year students at Junior High School 9 Tapung, and the object of this research was to analyze the use of LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension in descriptive text at the second year students of Junior High School 9 Tapung.

D. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of this research was the second year students of Junior High School 9 Tapung. It had two classes, VIII A was an experiment class and VIII B was a control class. Each class consisted of 20 students. The total number of students at the second year students of Junior High School 9 Tapung was 40 students. Because the population was not too large, so the technique used in taking the sample was total sampling technique. According to HidayatSyah, sample amounts equal to the population is called the total sample (total sampling).³¹ Furthermore Arikunto, if the amount of population is less than 100 students, the researcher must take all of the population, but if the amount of population is more than 100 students, it is better to take 10-15%, 25%, or more.³²

³¹HidayatSyah. *Pengantar Umum Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Verifikatif*. (Pekanbaru: Suska Press, 2010), p. 140.

³²Suharsimi Arikunto. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2006), p. 134.

Table III.2
Distribution of the Research Population and Sample

| No | Class | Number of students |
|-------|--------|--------------------|
| 1 | VIII A | 20 |
| 2 | VIII B | 20 |
| Total | | 40 |

E. The Technique of Collecting Data

To obtain the data needed in this research, the writer used technique as follows:

The writer had done pretest and posttest to experiment class and control class in order to know the effect of LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension in descriptive text at the second year students at state junior high school 9 Tapung. Before doing the test, the writer tried out the test items before students were given the test of this research. According to Huges, there are many techniques that can assess the students' comprehension but the writer used one technique called:³³Multiple choice techniques are a technique. This technique can assess the student's reading comprehension.

In addition, SuharsimiArikunto, says that there are some categories to evaluate the students' comprehension in reading text. The test as composed in 25 items and each item was given score 4³⁴. The scale is:

³³Hughes, Arthur. *Testing Language Teacher*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2003),p.143

³⁴SuharsimiArikunto. *Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan, EdisiRevisi*. (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara,2009), p.245.

Table III.3
The Categorizing Levels of Scoring of Reading Comprehension

| The Score of Reading Comprehension Level | Categories |
|---|-------------------|
| 80 – 100 | Very good |
| 66 – 79 | Good |
| 56– 65 | Enough |
| 40– 55 | Less |
| 30–39 | Fail |

Based on the table III.3, we can see that the level between 80-100 is very good, the level between 66-79 is good, the level between 56-65 is enough, the level between 40-55 is less, and the level between 30-39 is fail.

1. The Validity and Reliability Test

Heaton states that the validity of a test refers to appropriateness of a given test or any of its component parts as the measure of what it is purposed to measure³⁵. It means the test will be valid to the extent that is measured what it is supposed to measure. The type of validity is content validity. Referring to Bambang, Content validity is that if a measurement is as the representative of the ideas or the appropriate material that will be measured.³⁶ The materials were taken from the guide book for the students and other related resources.

³⁵Heaton. *Writing English Language Test*. (New York: Longman Group UK Limited, 1988), p. 159.

³⁶Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, *Metode Penelitian Pengajaran Bahasa Asing; Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Edisi Pertama, (Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2006), p. 23.

a. Validity

Before the tests were given to the sample, both of tests were tried out to 20 students at the second year. The purpose of try out was to obtain validity and reliability of the test. It was determined by finding the difficulty level of each item. Item difficulty was determined as the proportion of correct responses. The formula for item difficulty is as follows³⁷:

$$P = \frac{B}{JS}$$

Where

P : Index of difficulty or Facility value

B : the number of correct answers

JS : the number of examinees or students taking the test

The difficulty level of an item shows how easy or difficult a particular item in the test is. The items that do not reach the standard level of difficulty are excluded from the test and they are changed with the new items that are appropriate.

The standard level of difficulty used is **<0, 30** and **>0, 70**³⁸. It means that the item test is accepted if the level of difficulty is between 0.30-0.70 and it is rejected if the level of difficulty is below 0.30 (difficult) and over 0.70 (easy). Then, the

³⁷SuharsimiArikunto. *Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan*. (Jakarta: PT BumiAksara, 2009), p. 209

³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 210

proportion correct is represented by “p”, whereas the proportion incorrect is represented by “q”.

b. Reliability

A test must be reliable as measuring instrument. Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is measuring.³⁹ To know the reliability of the test, we should know: (a) the mean score, (b) the standard deviation of the test, and (c) Cronbach’s Alpha. The researcher used the SPSS 16.0 for windows-statistical software.

Tabel III.4

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 20 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 20 | 100.0 |

Based on the table III.4, we can see that the cases valid are 20 students, excluded 0, and the total students follow the test 20 students.

Table III.5

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 15.10 | 19.358 | 4.400 | 25 |

³⁹L. R. Gay and Peter Airasian, *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 2000), p. 169.

Based on the table III.5, we can see that mean score is 15.10, Variance is 19.358, Std. Deviation is 4.400, and number of item are 25.

Table III.6

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .711 | 25 |

Based on the table III.6, we can see that cronbach's Alpha is 0.711 and number of items are 25.

The score obtained compares to *r* table of product moment that the degree of freedom was 38 "*r*" product moment at the level of 5% is 0.304 and 1% is 0.393. The score obtained of Cronbach'sAlpa was 0.711 higher than *r* table whether 5% and 1% ($0.304 < 0.711 > 0.393$). It means that the test was reliable.According to Heaton the value of correlation coefficients is as follow⁴⁰:

1. 0.00– 0.20 Reliability is low
2. 0.21 – 0.40 Reliability is sufficient
3. 0.41 – 0.70 Reliability is high
4. > 0.70 Reliability is very high

⁴⁰Heaton.J.B. *Writing English Language Tests*.(New York: Longman Group UK Limited,1988), p.162

Based on the result above, reliability and validity of the test is including as highcategory.

F. The Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the writer used score of pre-test and post-test of experimental as well as and control group. These scores were analyzed statistically. The researcher used score of the experimental and the control classes. In order to find out whether or not there was a significant effect of using LRD strategy toward students' reading comprehension, the data were statistically analyzed by using T-test formula and using SPSS 16.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).⁴¹

Ho: $t_o < t\text{-table}$

Ha: $t_o > t\text{-table}$

Ho is an accepted if $t_o < t\text{-table}$ or there is no significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension in descriptive text of the second year students.

Ha is accepted if $t_o > t\text{-table}$ or there is a significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension in descriptive text of the second year students.

⁴¹Hartono, *Statistik untuk Penelitian*, (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2008), p. 180.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. Data Description

The purpose of the research was to obtain the students' reading comprehension who were taught by using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy and those who were taught without using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy, and to find out whether or not there was the significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension.

In this research, the writer got the data from the students' post test score of the experimental and control classes. Before that, the writer tried out another class beside experimental and control classes in order to prove whether the test was reliable or not. And the result of try out was 0.711. It means that the test was reliable. After the writer got the data from try out, the writer gave the students pre-test and post-test to the experimental and control classes. The questions for pre-test and post-test were multiple choices, and the text was descriptive text. Pre test was given to the experimental class and the control class before giving the treatment. Post-test was given to the students after giving the treatment, but the treatment was only given to the experimental class and for control class, the writer did not give the treatment. Then, the writer gave treatments to experimental class for eight meetings

B. Data Presentation

The data of this research were gotten from evaluation scores from each meeting and the scores of the students' pre-test and post-test. The data were collected by following procedures:

1. In the experimental and control classes, the students were asked to answer the questions based on the descriptive text.
2. The format of the test was multiple choices that consisted of 25 items.

1. Data Presentation of Students' Reading Comprehension who are Taught by Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) Strategy

The data of students' reading comprehension who were taught by LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy were obtained from pre-test and post-test of VIII^A as experimental class and VIII^B as control class taken from the sample each of this classes (20 students). The data can be seen from the table below:

Table IV.I

**The Scores of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Students' Reading
Comprehension of Experimental Class and Control Class**

| No | Students | Experimental Class | | Gain | Control Class | | Gain |
|----|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Pre-Test | Post-Test | | Pre-Test | Post-Test | |
| 1 | S-1 | 56 | 76 | 20 | 44 | 64 | 20 |
| 2 | S-2 | 64 | 72 | 8 | 56 | 64 | 8 |
| 3 | S-3 | 40 | 60 | 20 | 52 | 56 | 4 |
| 4 | S-4 | 48 | 68 | 20 | 56 | 68 | 12 |
| 5 | S-5 | 56 | 72 | 16 | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 6 | S-6 | 56 | 72 | 16 | 64 | 68 | 4 |
| 7 | S-7 | 40 | 64 | 24 | 68 | 72 | 4 |
| 8 | S-8 | 40 | 68 | 28 | 52 | 60 | 8 |
| 9 | S-9 | 60 | 72 | 12 | 44 | 48 | 4 |
| 10 | S-10 | 60 | 72 | 12 | 72 | 80 | 8 |
| 11 | S-11 | 56 | 68 | 12 | 64 | 68 | 4 |
| 12 | S-12 | 60 | 72 | 12 | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 13 | S-13 | 60 | 80 | 20 | 52 | 60 | 8 |
| 14 | S-14 | 40 | 72 | 4 | 52 | 64 | 12 |
| 15 | S-15 | 60 | 72 | 4 | 60 | 68 | 8 |
| 16 | S-16 | 64 | 76 | 8 | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 17 | S-17 | 64 | 72 | 16 | 52 | 56 | 4 |
| 18 | S-18 | 60 | 68 | 4 | 56 | 68 | 12 |
| 19 | S-19 | 80 | 88 | 16 | 56 | 68 | 12 |
| 20 | S-20 | 72 | 80 | 8 | 80 | 84 | 4 |
| | Total | 1136 | 1444 | 280 | 1160 | 1296 | 136 |
| | Mean | 56.80 | 72.20 | 14.00 | 58 | 64.8 | 6.80 |

From the table IV.I the researcher found that the total score of pre-test in experimental class was 1136, while the highest was 80 and the lowest was 40 and the

total score of post-test in experimental class was 1444, while the highest was 88 and the lowest was 60. Based on the data obtained, in the post-test of experimental class there was no student who did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained < 60 while there were 20 students who passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained ≥ 60 , and then, the researcher found that the total score of pre-test in control class was 1160, while the highest was 80 and the lowest was 44 and the total score of post-test in control class was 1296 while the highest was 84 and the lowest was 48. Based on data above, in the post-test of control class there were 3 students who did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained < 60 while there were 17 students passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained ≥ 60 .

C. The Data Analysis

1. Data Analysis of Students' Reading Comprehension who are Taught by Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy

The data of the students' post-test scores of experiment class were obtained from the result of their reading comprehension after giving the treatment. The data were obtained by using SPSS 16. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV.2

The Frequency Distribution Pre-test of Experimental Group

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | 40 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| | 48 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 25.0 |
| | 56 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 45.0 |
| | 60 | 6 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 75.0 |
| | 64 | 3 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 90.0 |
| | 72 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
| | 80 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table IV.2 shows the frequency distribution of experimental class before treatment. The output from 20 respondents, the valid percent with the interval of 40 was 20.0 %, the interval of 48 was 5.0%, the interval of 56 was 20.0%, the interval 60 was 30.0%, the interval 72 was 5.0%, and the interval 80 was 5.0%.

Table IV.3

The Frequency Distribution Post-test of Experimental Class

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | 60 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| | 64 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 |
| | 68 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 |
| | 72 | 9 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 75.0 |
| | 76 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 85.0 |
| | 80 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 95.0 |
| | 88 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table IV.3 shows the frequency distribution of experimental group before treatment. The output from 20 respondents, the valid percent with the interval of 60 was 5.0 %, the interval of 64 was 5.0%, the interval of 72 was 45.0%, the interval 76 was 10.0%, the interval 80 was 10.0%, and the interval 88 was 5.0%.

2. Data Analysis of Students' Reading Comprehension who are Taught without Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) Strategy

The data of students' post-test scores of control class were obtained from the result of their reading comprehension without using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV.4

The Frequency Distribution Pre-test of Control Class

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 44 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| | 52 | 5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 35.0 |
| | 56 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 55.0 |
| | 60 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 45.0 |
| | 64 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 85.0 |
| | 68 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 90.0 |
| | 72 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
| | 80 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table IV.4 shows the frequency distribution of control class, the score of pre-test. The output from 20 respondents, the valid percent with the interval of 44 was 10.0 %, the interval of 52 was 25.0%, the interval of 56 was 20.0%, the interval of 60 was 20.0%,the interval of 64 was 10.0%, the interval of 68 was 5.0%, the interval of 72 was 5.0%, and the interval of 80 was 5.0%.

Table IV.5

The Frequency Distribution Post-test of Control Group

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 48 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| | 56 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |
| | 60 | 4 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 |
| | 64 | 3 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 55.0 |
| | 68 | 6 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 85.0 |
| | 72 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 90.0 |
| | 80 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
| | 84 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table IV.5 shows the frequency distribution of control class, the score of post-test. The output from 20 respondents, the valid percent with the interval of 48 was 5.0 %, the interval of 56 was 10.0%, the interval of 60 was 20.0%, the interval of 64 was 15.0%, the interval of 68 was 30.0%, the interval of 72 was 5.0%, the interval of 80 was 5.0%, and the interval of 84 was 5.0%.

3. Data Analysis Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) Strategy toward Reading Comprehension

To obtain whether there is or not a significant effect of LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy, the writer used T-test formula by using software SPSS 16.0. The data were obtained through the gain of experimental class and control class.

Table IV. 6
Descriptive Statistics

| Class | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------|---|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Gainscore | 1 | 20 | 14.00 | 6.806 | 1.522 |
| | 2 | 20 | 6.80 | 4.919 | 1.100 |

Based on the table IV.6, it can be seen that the total of students from each class was 20, the mean of the experimental class was 14.00, and mean of the control class was 6.80. Standard deviation from the experimental class was 6.806, while standard

deviation from the control class was 4.919. Standard error mean of experimental class was 1.522, and control class was 1.100.

Table IV.7
Independent Samples Test

| | | Levine's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
| | | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Gains core | Equal variances assumed | 2.689 | .109 | 3.781 | 38 | .001 | 7.100 | 1.878 | 3.299 | 10.901 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 3.781 | 34.597 | .001 | 7.100 | 1.878 | 3.286 | 10.914 |

Based on the output SPSS above (table IV.11), independent sample T-Test shows *Levine's Test* for variance in this hypothesis examination:¹

Ho: Variance Population Identical

Ha: Variance Population not accepted

¹ Hartono, *SPSS 16.0 Analisis Data Statistik dan Penelitian*, (Pekanbaru: Pustaka Pelajar, 2007), p.159.

This statement based on the probability gate:

If Probability > 0.05 , H_0 is accepted

If Probability < 0.05 , H_a is rejected

From the table above, it can be seen that t_0 3.781 and df 38. The t_0 obtained is compared to t table either at 5% or 1%. At level of 5%, t table is 2.02 and at level of 1%, t table is 2.72. Based on t table, it can be analyzed that t_0 is higher than t table either at level of 5 % and 1%. In other words, we can read $2.02 < \mathbf{3.781} > 2.72$. So the researcher can conclude that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It means that there is significant effect of using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension of the second year students at State Junior High School 9 Tapung.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Reading is an essential skill that should be mastered by students. Reading is the important skill in finding the information in written language. The purpose of reading also determines the appropriate approach in reading comprehension.

LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy is a strategy which is used in this research. After the writer collected the data and analyzed the data, the result of the score shows that the students' reading comprehension taught by using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy is in **good category**. It can be compared with the students' reading comprehension taught without using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy that it is in **enough category**.

Furthermore, in finding the effect of Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy to improve students' reading comprehension of the second year students at state junior high school 9 Tapung Kampar Regency, of data analysis, the writer found the significant different score that showed 3.781. In level significant 5%, the score was 2.02. In level significant 1% the score was 2.75. It can be read $2.02 < 3.781 > 2.75$. It means that there is a significant effect of Using LRD (Listen, Read, Discuss) strategy toward reading comprehension of the second year students at state junior high school 9 Tapung Kampar Regency.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the research above, it is known that using Listen, Read, Discuss strategy toward students' reading comprehension. So that, Listen, Read, Discuss strategy is one of the choices by English teacher in order to increase students' reading comprehension.

After concluding a research at State Junior High School 9 Tapung, the writer would like to propose some suggestion to make teaching and learning process at this school get better than before. This suggestion is as follows:

1. The writer suggests the teacher of English subject to use the Listen, Read, Discuss strategy in teaching and learning process because it can improve students' reading comprehension.
2. The writer suggests the teacher of English subject to use the Listen, Read, Discuss strategy in teaching and learning process because it can make students active in sharing their thinking of the text to others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ag.Bambang, Setiyadi. 2006. *Metode Penelitian Pengajaran Bahasa Asing; Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Edisi Pertama. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Anthony V, & Manzo. 1995. *Teaching Children to be Literate: A Reflective Approach*. Sea Horbor : Literacy Leaders
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta, Rineka Cipta
- _____. 2009. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan, Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. *Kurikulum 2004 Standard Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMP/MTs*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum.
- Hartono. 2008. *Statistik Untuk Pendidikan*. Pekanbaru: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hasibuan, Kalayo, & Muhammad Fauzan. 2007. *Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Riau: Alaf Riau Gruba Unri Press.
- Heaton. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman Group UK Limited
- Hidayat Syah. 2010. *Pengantar Umum Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Verifikatif*. Pekanbaru: Suska Press.
- Homby, A. S. 1994. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, England*: Oxford University Press.
- Judith Westphal Irwin. 1986. *Teaching Reading Comprehension Process*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

John W. Creswell. 2008 *Educational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education, Vol. 23, No. 2, Fall/Winter, 2005

Gay, L. R. & Peter Airasian. 2000 *Educational Research Competences for Analysis and Application*. Six Ed. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall.

Mc Kenna Watkins and Manzo et al. 1993 *Teaching Children to be Literate A reflective Approach*. Sea Horbor : Literacy Leaders.

Michael F. Graves. 2001 *Teaching Reading in the 21st Century*. New York : A Pearson Education Company.

Murcia, Marianne Celce & Intosh, Lois Mc. 1979. *Teaching English as A Second or Foreign Language*. Los Angeles: University of California.

I.S.P Nation. 2009. *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing ESL & Applied Linguistic Professional Series*. New York: First Published

Norzazili. 2011. *The Application of "Listen-Read-Discuss" to Increase the Ability of the Second Year Students of Ma Darel Hikmah Pekanbaru in Comprehending Analytical Expository Texts*. Pekanbaru.

Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Nuttall, Christine. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London

Sudijono, Anas. 2009. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT. Raja findo Persada

Syafi'i. 2011. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: a Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. Pekanbaru : LBSI

Oxford learners pocket dictionary, 1994

Syllabus of SMPN9 Tapung Kampar Regency 2010/2011

Syllabus of SMPN9 Tapung Kampar Regency 2011/2012

Yusni Dian Rakhmawati. 2011 .Implementation of LRD (Listen-Read-Discuss) Model could improve SpeakingSkillsinFourth-Grade Students of SDNSumber Sari2 Malang.